DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 582 AC 006 760

AUTHOR	Kiefer, George W.
TITLE	State In-Service Training for Correctional Personnel. Final Report. Volume I.
INSTITUTION	Southern Illinois Univ., Carbondale. Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency and Corrections.
REPORT NO	O.L.E.A. Grant 197
PUB DATE	Oct 68
NOTE	69p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.55
DESCRIPTORS	*Corrective Institutions, Educational Needs, Educational Objectives, *Experimental Programs, *Inservice Education, *Personnel, Program Evaluation, Program Planning, Staff Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	*Illinois

ABSTRACT

Volume 1 of a final report in three volumes, this is an overall narrative account of a correctional staff training project in Illinois. The rationale of the project, methods and activities involved, findings, and evaluations are summarized and synthesized. Initial objectives were to survey training practices and needs; determine resources available for present and future staff training; design programs of training in terms of individual and agency needs; and stimulate conditions conducive to correctional staff training. A literature review, a questionnaire survey of correctional personnel, and solicitation of information from resource persons and agencies, were among the procedures used. Reports on relevant topics were distributed to those involved in or concerned with Illinois corrections. Based on findings, a much stronger state level commitment to correctional staff training was urged. Recommendations were also made on general planning and administration, and concerning the six penal institutions, the Illinois Youth Commission, and various other state and local correctional personnel. Finally, objectives and prospects for the immediate future were discussed. (See also AC 006 761 and AC 006 762. (LY)

AC006760

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED038582

FINAL REPORT

State In-Service Training For Correctional Personnel

O.L.E.A. Grant No. 197

Volume I

Prepared by:

THE CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF CRIME, DELINQUENCY AND CORRECTIONS
Southern Illinois University Carbondale, Illinois

AC006760

ED038582

FINAL REPORT

for

O.L.E.A. GRANT # 197

by

George W. Kiefer
Project Director

October 1968

--Volume I --

(This report is prepared in connection with OLEA Grant #197 and is jointly sponsored by the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, United States Department of Justice; the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections at Southern Illinois University; and with the cooperation of the Illinois Department of Public Safety.)

Preface

Volume one of OLEA grant # 197 Final Report provides the reader a narrative account of the total project. Here, our philosophies, methods, findings, and evalutations are summarized and synthesized to present an accurate overview of the study subject--correctional staff-training in Illinois.

Most of the topics discussed in this volume are considerably amplified in various sections of the accompanying volume two.

This Final Report is prepared in connection with OLEA grant # 197----State In-Service Training for Correctional Personnel----and is jointly sponsored by the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice; the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections at Southern Illinois University; and, with cooperation of the Illinois Department of Public Safety. In all instances, responsibility for documentation and authorship rests with the Project Director.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface

I. A Background for Project # 197

A. The Prevailing Corrections Movement 1
B. The OLEA Opportunity 3
C. A Mood of Willingness 6
D. The Grant Proposal 8

II. Project Management and Activities

A. Organization for Study 10
B. The Triadic Relationship 13
C. Activities and Feedback 15
D. Encounters: Won and Lost 21

III. Review of Project Findings and Recommendations

A. Current Status of Staff-Training 28
B. Some Needs--Many Recommendations 37
C. The Continuation Grant Proposal 50

IV. Looking Toward the Future

A. The OLEA Continuation Grant 57
B. Legislative Budgeting for Training 59
C. Utilization of New Knowledge 60

V. A Final Thought 66

I.

A Background for Project # 197

Through a propitious and unique combination of circumstances, an opportunity presented itself to study the entire Illinois system of corrections in terms of staff-training. In this section, we will discuss those circumstances and how the formal grant proposal was developed.

A. The Prevailing Corrections Movement. Corrections is moving, perhaps at times slowly and haltingly--but, it is moving. There is a decided trend towards bringing closer together the heretofore often highly separate realms of modern correctional theory and the realities of practice. In many instances, this converging tendency is noted at both poles; thus, giving significant suggestion each is recognizing the merits of alternate positions and of lessening philosophical rigidities.

In part, this trend is due to setting involvement by the academic correctionist. As he is continually exposed to the exigencies and demands of total correctional matrixes operative upon a given situation or client, he

finds himself in an increasingly advantageous position to refine his theory and methods. (The possibility of being co-opted by the system is, hopefully, not a relevant possibility here.)

Paralleling this development is the increased seeking for new answers, methods, attitudes, and philosophies by many who are actively involved in the field of corrections. Recent surveys have strongly indicated that a substantial share of correctional staffs are not satisfied with the role that corrections is playing today. Many of these, including significant numbers of administrators, are more and more looking to the academic correctionist for new thrusts and stimulation.

In addition to the slowly converging correction theory and practice, there is a growing awareness of the inadequacies of a system which advocates rehabilitation, but permits only custody. Until fairly recently, perhaps until the 1960's, this was the situation in most state correctional systems. Varying degrees of lip-service was given to the goals and methods of treatment and rehabilitation; however, the absolute need for security and custody was usually paramount in correctional programming. It was as if

rehabilitation and security could not exist at the same time.

Recently, this overwhelming concern with custody and security has been critically reviewed by many sources. The inefficiency and uneconomical nature of correctional programming is based upon an overriding concern with security and custody has been exposed to the public, correctional staff, and to appropriations sources. Consequently, a move has developed to produce correctional programming which, while taking into account fully the legitimate needs of security and custody, presents a design appropriate for re-structuring the inmate personality and activities in terms which are presumably necessary for 'success' in the free community. This program change is very a very slow process and, for a variety of reasons, now meets and will continue to meet substantial resistance from many quarters. Nevertheless, the movement is a growing one.

B. The O.L.E.A. Opportunity. Although it was likely that a study of Illinois correctional staff-training would have eventually been undertaken in the absence of federal funding, a demonstrable boost was given by their availability at this time.

The L.E.A.A. Legislation developed as part of a comprehensive program for federal participation in the total nationwide effort to control organized crime. As a main contribution to this effort, L.E.A.A. activity centered on providing direct assistance to state and community agencies having criminal justice responsibilities. Approximately 7½ million dollars was available for project funding each year.

Since L.E.A.A. operational role emphasizes "providing an infusion of ideas ans support for experiments, for new programs", agency activity assumed two main courses. On the one hand, a variety of individual studies and projects were funded to produce essential information and program models appropriate for criminal justice programs. The other main course provided funds which would "stimulate wide-scale improvement efforts in areas of special need". Emphasis in the latter grants has been to support those proposals which are productive of local and state agency self-improvement, and which have the potentiality for self-sustaining operation after the termination of federal funding.

Our current study developed in terms of the latter activity and is paralled by similar efforts in about half of the states. In early 1967, Center staff at the Carbondale campus of Southern Illinois University initiated development of a study proposal concerned with in-service correctional staff-training. The proposal was formulated in terms of a statewide and across-the-board personnel level; however, primary focus for study and programming was placed upon two concerns: (a.) enhancement of roles played by institutional correctional officers in the total effort directed towards inmate rehabilitation; and (b.) the development of various community-based correctional staff roles. Of especial importance to study design was the cooperation and insights shared by Illinois Department of Public Safety staff with Center personnel as the proposal developed.

In mid-year 1967, OLEA approval was given to our proposal for a study of--State In-Service Training for Correctional Personnel. Co-sponsored by the Center and the Illinois Department of Public Safety, a total of $13766.00 was awarded to fund the six-month study period. After some delay, a project director was selected and the study formally initiated on January 1, 1968.

C. A Mood of Willingness. Although the funding opportunity came from outside of Illinois corrections and provided substantial stimulus for undertaking this type of study, it was essential that a strong element of cooperation and interest be shown by Illinois corrections. Specifically, the Illinois Department of Public Safety necessarily had to formally endorse the study project. (Similar endorsement was not sought from the many other correctional agencies in Illinois because of project focus.)

With frankness we must admit that it would have been easy for the Department to let us operate the project and give little more than token lip-service to the study activities. Such was not to be the case. At the direction of Mr. Ross Randolph, Director, Illinois Department of Public Safety, freedom of access to agency facilities and staff was provided for the project director. Through the designation of Mr. Arthur Huffman as Departmental liaison for this project we were able to proceed in the most effective possible manner--and with many of the anticipated rough spots (resistance by various staff elements) smoothed out in advance.

In addition to the cooperation shown by Director Randolph and Mr. Huffman, many other Department staff demonstrated an obvious willingness to encourage and assist the objectives of our study. Contrary to the often-heard comment about rigidity and uncooperativeness of correctional staff, we did not find significant evidence of these attitudes as they reflected on project opinions. Rather, our experiences with Illinois correctional staff in the Department are complementary to those noted in a recent Louis Harris Associates Nationwide Survey of corrections staff; that is, such staff is concerned with more effective correctional programming and an enhanced staff capability for a meaningful role in client rehabilitation.

Although the comments appearing in this section are primarily directed towards the Illinois Department of Public Safety, to a large extent they are also applicable to most other correctional units in the state. For example, the Illinois Youth Commission staff, in a study slightly preceeding our present project, indicated a high degree of interest in both continuing and increasing agency program effectiveness. Their recognition of the need for self-evaluation in agency programming was dramatically obvious during the study.

D. The Grant Proposal. As previously indicated, the grant proposal for this study was developed in early 1967 as a cooperative effort by Southern Illinois University and the Illinois Department of Public Safety. Primary responsibility for proposal developed at S.I.U. rested with Professors Charles Matthews (Director of the Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections) and John Grenfell. For the Department of Public Safety, Mr. Arthur Huffman provided a primary consultative assistance and liaison resource.

The initial objectives of O.L.E.A. grant # 197 can be summarized as follows:

a.) an intensive survey of staff-training practices and needs among the many correctional agencies and services of Illinois;

b.) a wide-ranging survey of resources appropriate for incorporation in present and future correctional staff-training plans;

c.) design of staff-training programs for correctional personnel in terms of individual and agency needs;

d.) stimulation of conditions facilitative to the establishment and continuance of correctional staff-training.

Each objective was integrated into the various activities during the study period. As we were able to accumulate

knowledge, an effort was made to outreach and set additional pertinent objectives having special relevance for our study project.

A general outline of study priorities was presented in the proposal; however, with substantial flexibility allowing and encouraging adjustments as the study developed. Major thrust of the project objectives was to remain static.

II

Project Management and Activities

Since the initial proposal provided relatively little structure, it may be worthwhile to briefly comment upon how the study project was implemented and given effective operational structure.

A. Organization for Study

As previously indicated, a series of interim goals/objectives were developed by which we could measure preject progress and impact. Foremost among these was the reaching of a goodly representation of Illinois correctional personnel (either key personnel or functional representatives) so as to assure an accurate view of the whole and its parts. This was accomplished through extensive interviews and a large-scale questionaire.

A second interim objective was the securing of initial indications for support of those correctional orientations and methods advocated by professionals in the field. Since our built-in view of staff-training must be conceptually-based in this arena of rehavilitation and treatment consistent with the real needs of security, we felt the need for strategizing our project in terms which would gain support from key personnel. To do this, we talked at

length with management securing their views and competent advice based upon their many years experience. In turn, we were able to explain some of our views and perceptions relative to the need for and place of staff-training in Illinois corrections. While agreement was not always reached, a channel of future communication and access for the implementation of correctional staff-training was opened.

Our third interim objective was to provide feedback to correctional personnel in Illinois. To do this most effectively, we have provided a series of reports focused upon selected topics relevant to correctional staff-training in Illinois. Each has been distributed among selected agencies and individuals involved in, or having interests in, Illinois corrections.

To accomplish our goals and interim objectives most effectively and efficiently, project activities were structured so as to provide readily indentifiable and actively meaningful data. Methods used to study the Illinois system complexity, time allotted, funds and other resources available; however, at no point did we feel that these limitations seriously interfered with our progress towards goal achievement.

A major method used to obtain information found the project director involved in extensive interviewing of correctional personnel (at all levels of responsibility), in locations and organizations throughout the state. A second method involved the use of a written questionnaire distributed to approximately 1,800 personnel in correctional elements of the Illinois Department of Public Safety. The 1,282 respondent questionnaires are being processed at this writing. A third method concerns the review of literature touching upon corrections in Illinois. This included access to much material not available to the general public.

Our fourth method utilized the good counsel and advice of many resource persons and agencies having involvement with or interest in Illinois correctional clients. Included in this category was the use of an out-of-state consultant (Mr. Paul Bailey), to review our project and preliminary-draft continuation grant proposal. Finally, from personal observations of the many correctional settings in Illinois, we were able to draw certain tentative conclusions relevant for the needs and opportunities applicable to staff-training.

B. The Triadic Relationship.

There are those who say that having two bosses is a very difficult situation, and three would be an impossible way of life; nevertheless, experience during the O.L.E.A. grant #197 study demonstrated that such arrangements can be both workable and productive.

The tridaic relation members are (1) the Office of Law Enforcement Assistance as the primary funding source; (2) the Illinois Department of Public Safety as our primary study setting; and (3) Southern Illinois University. A little might be said here about the contribution made by each agency.

The Office of Law Enforcement Assistance (O.L.E.A.) provided the majority of funds used in this project; however, the other assistances provided were also of major importance for project operation and productiveness. Two O.L.E.A. program managers provided our contact with agency philosophy, guidelines, and requirements. Each gave substantial indication of their interest in our study, and to structuring the agency-study relation in ways which would permit maximum local flexibility for achieving of project goals and objectives.

As co-sponsor of O.L.E.A. proposal #197, the Illinois Department of Public Safety was in a position to exert considerable influence upon study activities. We are pleased that they did so, and in a very constructive manner. Through the efforts of Mr. Arthur Huffman, study activities within the Department were given wide latitude and guaranteed freedom to facility and staff access.

The Center for the Study of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections at Southern Illinois University assumed the formal funding contract with O.L.E.A. It was the responsibility of the Center to provide the staff, resources, and direction to insure study objectivity and accuracy. In addition to project staff, other staff of the Center were made available to the study as needed and appropriate. Additional needed resources were provided by the Center which would have been otherwise unobtainable with the given level of federal funding available.

C. Activities and Feedback. The project director has engaged in a wide variety of tasks, ranging from ordering of supplies to administrative-level conferences. Without either activity, our study project would have fallen short of the desired level of optimal effectiveness, inclusiveness, and economy. For purposes of this report, we will limit ourselves to a brief description of each project activity--except for housekeeping chores.

1. Interviewing Survey: A significant part of our activity has concerned itself with extended periods of interviewing correctional personnel, clients, and other interested publics. This activity, almost all of which occurred on the home-grounds of the interviewee, was aimed at uncovering the staff-training needs in Illinois correctional agencies. Approximately 250 individuals were contacted for varying types of interviews, and the activity occupied about 50% of project time.

2. Questionnaire Survey: A second major element in project design involved use of three written questionnaires. The first questionnaire, distributed to 102 county sheriffs in Illinois, was specifically focused upon the current staff-training needs, activity, and interest in local correctional facilities. Approximately 65% of our questionnaires were returned and provide the basis for a separate report.

The second written questionnaire was distributed to 102 probation offices; however, our response rate was only about 24%. The responses are recorded in other reports. Added emphasis was placed upon interviews with this group, due to the low questionnaire response rate.

The third written questionnaire was designed to obtain a brief demographic picture of Illinois Department of Public Safety correctional-element employees, and to

determine their interests/willingness for staff-training. We have 1,282 completed questionnaires (approximately a 71% return rate on this voluntary, anonymous testing instrument). Analysis of the resulting information strongly suggests a high degree of interest in staff-training--and a willingness to participate, given certain conditions. A separate report is included in Volume II of this Final Report to adequately deal with the survey.

3. Literature Survey: Particular effort was devoted to careful evaluation of publications by or about corrections in Illinois. In addition to the more obvious sources (newspapers, annual reports, etc.), several documents focused upon one or more elements in Illinois corrections were closely examined. Reading of such materials made possible a broader view of correctional programming, needs, problems, and resources--and all contributing to a better long-range understanding of how project activities could best and most effectively serve the field.

4. Reports: A report will, ideally, summarize and inform. During the project, separate reports produced upon various topics relevant for Illinois correctional staff-training. For the most part, each has been distributed to a number of correctional officials and middle-management in Illinois; and, in addition, copies have been supplied to O.L.E.A. and various other interested persons. Specifically, reports that have been issued as project activities include the following:

#1 Reply to O.L.E.A. Questionaire
#2 O.L.E.A. Quarterly Report #1
#3 Report on Questionnaire to Illinois Sheriffs
#4 Current Status of Staff-Training in Illinois Corrections
#5 Staff-Training in the Illinois Youth Commission
#6 Assessment of Staff-Training in Illinois Corrections
#7 O.L.E.A. Quarterly Report #2
#8 Report on Demonstration Training Activities
#9 NEWSLETTER for Illinois Correctional Staff-Training

#10 Questionnaire Survey: Analysis and Commentary
#11 Survey of Literature Concerning Illinois Corrections
#12 Listing of Films for Correctional Staff-Training
#13 O.L.E.A. #197 Continuation Grant Proposal
#14 Consultant Reports
#15 O.L.E.A. # 197 Interim Report
#17 Budget Recommendations for State-Supported Correctional-Staff-Training
Supplemental Budget Requests to Legislature: 1969-1971.

Copies of the most significant reports are attached in the Appendix of this interim report.

5. Resources Determination: During the project, we were especially concerned that correctional staff-training resources be located, propagandized for support, and tentatively programmed into future staff-development programs. In as much as we strongly feel that correctional staff-training must be primarily an in-house program, untapped correctional organization resources for training were closely scanned. Information gathered suggests a wide variety of appropriate training resources, both within corrections and in other agencies; however, until this time, these desirable resources have not been adequately tapped for fullest appropriate use. Continuation-grant programming is specifically designed to capitalize on these resources and further in-house training capability among the various Illinois correctional agencies.

6. Assist in Preparation of Legislative-Request for Correctional Staff-Training Budget Estimates: While an O.L.E.A. continuation grant is expected to provide substantial support ($38958.02), during the program year (9/1968-9/69), the Illinois Department of Public Safety agreed to a substantial commitment of state resources ($178,000.00) we are looking forward in years and to the ongoing training activity. Accordingly, at the invitation of state officials, we have developed and submitted training program budget estimates for Department inclusion in requests to the coming Legislative session.

7. National Conference on Correctional Training: In April, the project director attended a national conference of O.L.E.A. state correctional training-grant recipients. The purpose of this conference was to mutually explore the needs, activities, and problems common to many state projects. Presently, we are engaged in developing tentative plans for a similar conference (on a regional level), at our Center, at the request of N.C.C.D.

8. NEWSLETTER for Illinois Correctional Staff-Training: As a stimulant and resource for staff-training, the first issue of our NEWSLETTER was published in early August. Initial distribution included 100 persons (almost all in Illinois), who are (1.) actively engaged in corrections or who have strong interests in the correctional field, and (2.) are in a position to assist in the implementation of training activities. Present plans call for publication of the NEWSLETTER on a monthly gratis basis. A copy is attached in the Appendix.

9. Demonstration Training Program - Vienna: As part of O.L.E.A. project #197, a demonstration training program was implemented at Vienna State Penitentiary - a minimum-security facility located in close proximity to Southern Illinois University. The program, a monthly training session attended by volunteers among the regular personnel group and inmates, was designed to provide periods of free discussion among participants. This program is detailed in a separate section to the Appendix of this Final Report.

A second demonstration program - the NEWSLETTER for Illinois Correctional staff-Training - has been discussed previously. Plans have progressed to the point of implementation for two other planning workshops; however, these await formal O.L.E.A. funding commitment for a continuation-grant year.

10. Consultants: Our study project has had available an unusually large number of consultants due to a concurrent nationwide training program here at the Center. This latter training program, also sponsored by O.L.E.A., brought together correctional administrators twice during the past six months. Through conversation

and conference, valuable informal consultation was obtained without added cost to O.L.E.A. grant #197.

A second source of consultation was Mr. Paul Bailey, Assistant Superintendent, Indiana State Reformatory. Mr. Bailey spent a day with us reviewing the proposal content and project activities. His insights proved to be particularly useful in insuring that proposal outlines were adequately geared to the reality of current correctional programs. A copy of Mr. Bailey's follow-up letter is included in the Appendix.

Finally, invaluable assistance has been provided by Illinois Department of Public Safety staff and members of the Crime Center staff at Southern Illinois University. Among the former, special note is given to Arthur V. Huffman, state criminologist; and the latter, Professor John Grenfell.

11. General Advisory Board: For various reasons of strategy, formal implementation of a hi-level General Advisory Board was not sought until two-thirds through the grant period; however, at the point when we did want formal implementation, several local events occurred to delay us, even to the present time. Presently, the Governor's office is holding formal appointment of General Advisory Board members until an opportune time; in the meantime, we have used the services of an informal advisory board to assist in guaranteeing project quality and appropriateness.

12. Films for Correctional Staff-Training: As a service to persons engaged in Illinois correctional staff-training, we have prepared a listing of appropriate films for use in training programs. The listing (including specifications of availability and use) is particularly written for Illinois; however, a substantial number are useful elsewhere. Approximately fifty copies of this listing have been distributed - mostly in Illinois - and it is expected that the list will be updated periodically.

13. Contact With Groups Interested in Corrections: In addition to working with and/or through the various official Illinois correctional organizations, we have

developed contacts with other individuals and groups having significant interest in corrections. Among the latter are (1.) the Illinois Division of Vocation Rehabilitation, (2.) The Illinois Commission on Local Law Enforcement, (3.) the John Howard Society (Chicago), and (4.) various other educational facilities in Illinois. In each instance, possibilities of resource-production for staff-training was explored. It is anticipated that future involvement with each of the listed agencies holds potential for training in the future.

14. Visibility: A significant portion of project activity provided a measure of visible evidence to Illinois correctional personnel of our interest in correctional staff-training. By visibility, we assure such personnel of our continued "realistic" planning activities; and, at the same time, provide an effective communications access between the correctional workers and project staff.

15. Continuation-Grant Proposal: As a major objective of O.L.E.A. grant #197, we have formulated a continuation-grant proposal based upon the current needs and situations of Illinois corrections; plus, taking into account anticipated emerging needs and programs for the future. Formal agreement and commitment of substantial resources by the Illinois Department of Public Safety and Southern Illinois University are included in the continuation-grant proposal. As such, the proposal reflects our best estimate of current training needs and appropriate solutions. (The O.L.E.A. continuation-grant proposal has previously been forwarded to Washington, D.C.).

D. Encounters: Won and Lost.

Until this point, we may have given the impression that O.L.E.A. Study Project #197 proceeded smoothly and without significant problems being encountered. This was not the case, however. A number of problems have been met and overcome during the study; others, however, aviod further effort and opportunity before solutions can be obtained. Below are briefly described a few of the more significant situations and problems.

1. The Initial Approach: While the grant proposal presented a guideline for action, it could not supply detailed instructions appropriate for the emergent needs to be encountered in a study and planning grant. The first major task, therefore, was for the Project Director to establish in considerable detail the orientations and dimensions of this project. In part, this was accomplished through a review of Illinois correctional organizations as they exist on paper - so as to identify appropriate starting points for study.

A second method involved consultations with various university-based personnel and/or correctional-practitioners who could give added meaning and clarity towards our initial efforts. (including, among others, Arthur V. Huffman of the Illinois Department of Public Safety; Olin Stead of the Illinois Youth Commission; Joseph Rowan of the John Howard Society-Chicago; Charles Ruddell of the Chicago House of Correction; and Professors Johnson, Matthews, Grenfell, and Dreher of our Center at Southern Illinois University)

The third method involved two meetings of interested Center staff, Director Ross Randolph of the Illinois Department of Public Safety, Arnold Hopkins of O.L.E.A., and the Project

Director to discuss the project in broad terms. Here, as with previously described methods, the subject-matter parameters of proposal interest became increasingly more-clearly defined.

Finally, a brief written statement of our proposed course of action was circulated among interested personnel and agencies. From this, project activities were scheduled (and often rescheduled), to meet a series of interim objectives leading towards the production of a single unified state-wide plan of correctional staff training.

2. Access to Illinois Correctional Organizations: Although the chief administrative official of the Illinois Department of Public Safety formally agreed to the original #197 proposal, actual development and implementation was necessarily left to the project director. For the Department, a liaison representative was appointed in the person of Mr. Arthur Huffman, State Criminologist. Points of access into Department organization and functioning were programmed.

However, Illinois corrections encompasses much more than the Department of Public Safety. In the case of other organizations, access was usually obtained directly through the organization's chief administrative officer; although, in some instances, this did not allow the freedom of access experienced in our relationship with the Department of Public Safety.

Whereever possible, emphasis was placed upon talking with administration, middle-management, and representatives of the line staff groupings in each organization. In most cases, this caused minimal disruption of daily organization activities; however, in others, it is certain that some organizations went beyond-the-call of necessity in providing us with assistance and access. A very few offices were reluctant to cooperate with the goals and methods of our project.

In summary, access to Illinois correctional organizations has generally been excellent. The major agencies, as well as most of the minor ones, have shown cooperation with the goals and methods utilized in grant #197 study project. Of equal

importance, the informal channels have been opened which will be useful in implementation of staff-training programs described in our continuation-grant proposal.

3. Complexity of Illinois Corrections: Illinois corrections is not under one administrative head; or budget; or budget; or orientation; or set of guidelines. The result is a highly varied group of organizations which, in many instances, have only their public-offender client in common. In addition, even in the major agencies with their large staffs and client populations, unit administrators exhibit much autonomy from the agency central office.

In terms of the #197 study project, this high degree of hetrogeneity significantly complicates our methods and final product. For example, there are approximately 25 correctional unit administrators (at the warden or similar levels), 102 probation administrators, and 102 county sheriffs - all of these having significant or total involvement with the corrections processes. In addition, the state is about 450 miles by 225 miles in size. Correctional clients in Illinois number well above 19,000, exclusive of those on county probation.

To reach significant points in this complicated setting a strategy was mapped to insure development of a representative picture of Illinois corrections. In some instances, this called for a questionnaire as a general survey instrument; in others, extended interviews were utilized with key and representative staff personnel. The emerging picture presents, we believe, an accurate view of staff-training in Illinois corrections; however, because of system complexity and the limited time/resources available during this project, it will not present the detailed view of every unit's training or needs.

4. Illinois Corrections' Traditions: From review of past publications concerning Illinois corrections, it is apparent that the history of this social welfare area is strongly rooted in a custodial orientation. Although rehabilitation has been and is being called for by various administrators, correctional professionals, and others, the hard fact remains that security/custody is a prime concern of most Illinois correctional organizations.

Even in probation and parole, for example, significant emphasis is placed upon the needs and exigencies of security programming, often to the exclusion of those activities having a genuine positive, long-lasting, rehabilitative effect upon the client. The need for innovation, experimentation, and demonstration programming is deferred to the traditional concern with security, custody, public protection, and similar comfortable catchwords used to justify a lack of correctional movement.

There are exceptions to, or dents in, this Illinois tradition. In the Department of Public Safety, the Criminologists' Division is much concerned to develop individual client programs which are based upon a philosophy of treatment and rehabilitation; however, implementation of such client programs (and, indeed, of service functions by the Criminologist staff itself), is the responsibility of individual institutional administrators. If the latter is not convinced of the Criminologist staff usefulness as is apparently the case in some instances, it is very likely that these professional recommendations will be bypassed.

Similar examples exist elsewhere in Illinois. Even though a given unit may express interest in or desire for a therapeutic client approach which is not so completely immersed in the security/custodial tradition, their actual programs exhibit strong roots in this orientation. This is understandable when the career development patterns in Illinois corrections are examined. Many administrators, in-bred within a system having this strong security-custodial emphasis over the years, are reluctant to move far from the needs it demands; however, only a very few correctional administrators in Illinois appear to be totally rigid. It is this small (but growing, slowly), willingness to permit, and then encourage, change that our continuation-grant proposal will build upon during the coming months.

5. Priorities: Previous discussion in this report suggests the need for a system of priorities, both in terms of project activities, products, and item-inclusion

within the continuation-grant proposal. In development of these priorities, full account was taken of situations then existing and of the need for flexibility permitting additions or deletions as project progress warranted.

Accordingly, a plan was devised which incorporated intensive study of Illinois Department of Public Safety institutional correctional units. This emphasis was frankly based upon Department willingness, large client and staff groupings, and our initial estimate of readiness and need. Secondary study emphasis was placed upon (a.) local correctional institutional facilities (the jails); (b.) the Illinois Youth Commission (not a primary emphasis since grant #197 is specifically based upon adult corrections; included, however, because a substantial client group is 17 years of age or older); (c) adult parole service of the Illinois Department of Public Safety; (d) probation agencies. Passing examination and study of police lockup was also a part of this survey. Further, we were interested to discover how representatives of other non-correctional agencies provide services to correctional clients at this time--or how such activity could be enhanced and stimulated in the future. In planning of the continuation-grant proposal, the priorities and needs indicated previously have been incorporated.

6. Meaningful Reports: A number of topic-centered reports have been written, duplicated, and distributed during the course of this project. In addition to the obligatory copies sent to O.L.E.A., copies have been furnished to correctional unit administrators through out Illinois, to various key administrators in selected resource agencies, to professional corrections organizations, and to the Correctional Training Resources Center of N.C.C.D. We believe that this wide distribution is essential if interest is to be sufficiently stimulated towards implementation of meaningful staff-training programs.

Each report thus far produced has been focused upon one topic. Although conceptually-grounded in social science theory, considerable effort has been devoted to producing documents which will have direct meaning to correctional staff and administrators. Each report has been planned to provide a stimulus for movement towards correctional staff-training. To obtain this movement in a positive and long-lasting way, it was and continues to be our judgement that the "expose" type of report is uncalled for in this project.

7. Department Commitment to Continuation Proposal: Page 3.2 and 3.3 provide a summary of Illinois Department of Public Safety commitments to the continuation-grant year. Details of these commitments are found in individual program budgets. We are frankly pleased and gratified at the response of this Department. It is our belief that, with this resource commitment, we will be in a position to implement staff-training at a level not believed possible for several years, or months, ago. Perhaps most importantly, however, is the indirectly enhanced status it will give to staff-training within the various Departmental units.

8. Project Advisory Board: During the project period, considerable utilization of an informally drawn advisory board has occurred. The board (representing education, corrections, and resources), provided much advice and informal evaluation of our project activities--as well as reports and proposal. As the time for continuation-grant proposal implementation neared, we have taken the steps to secure establishment of a formal General Advisory Board (G.A.B.), with appointments to be made by the Governor of Illinois. It is our understanding that the request and complementary materials are currently on the Governor's desk for action. Selected for inclusion on the G.A.B., subject to acceptance by the Governor, are the persons representing corrections, social service agencies, and the private sector.

9. The Continuation Grant Proposal: A major problem at this time remains the method of implementing programs provided in continuation-grant funding. To a considerable extent, the original and continuation-grant proposal were so designed as to form one continuous effort with new activities implemented on a regular schedule; thus, towards the termination point of the original grant we initiated tentative plans for putting the new training programs into operation. This was viewed as essential due to the "lead" time necessary for scheduling of personnel.

Unfortunately, the O.L.E.A. continuation-grant proposal has not been re-funded at this point. Despite repeated assurances by agency personnel in Washington, D.C., the continuation programs remain in a "holding" status. It has been very difficult to explain this delay to Illinois correctional administrators, and especially so in terms which will not be prejudicial towards further O.L.E.A. or "outside"-sponsored activities within the corrections system. We are hopeful that this problem will be overcome shortly.

III

Review of Project Findings and Recommendations

Volume II of this Final Report includes reprints of major reports produced during the course of project study. The reader is referred to that volume for each extended report. In the following pages, a rather brief picture is given of selected reports.

A. Current Status of Staff-Training. Several of the project reports have dealt extensively with this general topic. In each, a genuine effort was made to capture the thrust and orientation of the individual agencies or organizations being discussed.

1. The Illinois Department of Public Safety: This unit has responsibility for adult non-local institutional corrections and adult parole services, and operates six institutional facilities with a population of about 8,700 inmates and a field parole unit supervising over 3,000 parolees. For this client population, the Department has 1,400 institutional employees whose primary role is concerned with custody, 500 other institutional employees, and 63 parole agents/supervisors. The most recent Departmental budget includes an appropriation of $32,700,000 for correctional services and activities (exclusive of $8,300,000 for prison industries).

The Department of Public Safety does not have a General Office staff position concerned primarily with correctional staff-training. Individual General Office staff have expressed varying degrees of interest in such training,

but little concrete and substantive interest in this activity has been demonstrated until recently. It is the writers subjective impression based upon study over the past months that most General Office level staff support the idea of a much expanded staff-training program; however, the priority assigned to training as compared to other Departmental or facility operations is somewhat disappointing. It is apparent that a clear notion of the advantages, means, and programs of modern staff-training methodology has not sufficiently been explained to many in this group. The absence of top administrative overt support for this activity may account for the low priority.

2. Joliet Penitentiary: Four geographically and logistically partially separated units are included under this rubric. In addition to Joliet-Statesville and Joliet Branch (each large maximum-security units with vocational, educational, work, and secure non-activity settings) there is a Prison Farm and the Diagnostic Depot. Each unit has its own distinct culture, set of values and attitudes, and method of operation -- all of this within the context of an overall effort by the Warden to organize the units in a manner that will stimulate their acting as one unit. The Joliet complex employs nearly 800 staff, with a little over 600 being in custodial roles.

It has been Departmental policy that all new line custodial personnel will receive orientation training at the Joliet complex. A lieutenant in the custody force has duties exclusively concerned with planning and implementing this training. The orientation training program varies in length from two to three weeks and enrolls between twenty-five and fifty trainees. As would be expected, nearly exclusive emphasis is placed upon the many aspects of custody and security which are to be so important for the line officer employee.

Some activity has been noted in providing in-service training for small portions of the total custodial staff. Other sporadic training activities have taken place to meet specific needs or problems; however, such training was always brief and did not have the systematic

continuing aspect which modern training programs must have for greatest effectiveness. It must be noted that staffing problems, until the very recent past, were such as would have imposed considerable hardship upon institutional administration and staff, should an intensive staff-training program have been in operation. About one year ago, a lieutenant assigned to Joliet attended an eight-week workshop at Southern Illinois University (funded by O.L.E.A.) to assist in developing his ability as a training officer.

One additional training activity bears mentioning. For a number of years, the Department of Public Safety sponsored a full-time six-week Correctional Staff-Education Institute at Lewis College in Lockport, with most subsistence facilities being provided at Joliet. The program brought together a scattering of Department personnel from around the state, and attempted to provide them with a common foundation of corrections knowledge. Technical as well as general information was presented during the Institutes. From comments elicited during interviews with persons who had been involved in the Institutes (either as instructor or trainee) it is apparent that the training was well-received and germane to the role of correctional employees.

In summary, the Joliet facilities have in operation a full-time orientation training program for new line officers and a very short training program for other new staff members. The in-service training program, however, is minimal--both in terms of program presented and numbers involved. Present administrative attitude at the facility suggests a real interest in expanding both types of training activity. In addition, while the facility is not overstaffed by any stretch of the imagination, administration has indicated that staff time will be available for future training activities, and that this could be during normal working hours. In a sentence, the future for staff-training at the Joliet facility seems promising--and especially if outside assistance is available for planning, implementation, and consultation assistance.

3. Pontiac Penitentiary: This facility is a medium to maximum-security unit whose primary mission involves the custody and rehabilitative treatment of young inmates (17-25 years of age). The inmate population averages about twelve-hundred, with staffing at approximately 235 custodial and 90 non-custodial employees. Up until the past two or three years, the Pontiac facility received its new line correctional officers from Joliet by transfer; however, with increasingly severe staff shortages and the difficulty in obtaining transfer applicants for Pontiac, informal permission was granted for the institution to do its own recruiting and training. This course has been followed with direct responsibility for such training falling to the senior guard captains at Pontiac. In the main course, an on-the-job training model was followed with the new officer being placed next to a seasoned employee who could presumably pass on appropriate and necessary knowledge. No formal program of systematic and evaluation-stimulating knowledge has been produced to this point. In-service training activity is proceeding on a rather small-scale, although with some consistency.

In summary, the Pontiac facility has a severely limited staff-training program which reaches limited numbers. Little impetus towards much further training is currently in view for several reasons -- perhaps the two most serious of which are (a.) a strong concern with current staffing problems, and (b.) a strong undercurrent of management disinclination towards acceptance of training values within current Departmental and institutional patterns or limits. On the other hand, some interest has been expresses in training which would be directly germane to the individual employee role -- a note of optimism in an otherwise difficult picture for future training possibilities at Pontiac.

4. Menard Penitentiary: The Menard complex is composed of three units--the general division, the psychiatric division, and the prison farm. A diagnostic depot for Southern Illinois is also at Menard. All are under the administrative direction of a single warden. With an average inmate population of slightly under 2,000, Menard has a custodial staff of about 340 and a non-

custodial staff of 130. The mission of this facility parallels that of Joliet--basically maximum-security setting for custody and rehabilitation. The psychiatric division at Menard provides a unique setting in Illinois with inmates being placed there directly by the courts or by transfer from other Departmental institutions. Clients in this unit are inmates first, patients second. The most recent population average for the psychiatric division was approximately 450.

Staff training at Menard has not been a priority item in the past and until very recently, has been given only token interest. As will be recalled, orientation training of new line officers takes place at Joliet; however, additional orientation training must presumably occur when an employee transfers to another institution, including Menard. At the latter, a transferred line correctional officer will receive one to two weeks of special orientation training providing him with the necessary set of attitudes, skills, and knowledge which will permit his most effective performance in the new job. As was heard elsewhere, it was not unusual to hear the comment at Menard that the newly-transferred employee needed to be untrained--then retrained for the reality factors inherent in his job role.

Staff-training on an in-service basis has not taken place to any significant degree in recent years. Such programming has not been of a systematic and continuing nature as is deemed to be necessary by professional trainers for maintaining high levels of employee performance. A few employees have attended various courses in nearby colleges. Recently, a lieutenant has attended an eight-week institute at Southern Illinois University with the purpose of becoming more knowledgable in the contents and techniques applicable to correctional staff-training.

In summary, Menard has provided orientation re-training for transferred employees; however, in-service training has been minimal. There is substantial <u>reason to believe that administration is receptive to the notion of a moderately intensive staff-training program for current employees</u>--

provided that training logistics and content areas are carefully programmed. It appears that the future for staff-training at Menard is moderately bright within the foreseeable future.

5. Vienna Penitentiary. With an average inmate population of approximately 160 and a custodial staff of approximately 40 out of about 80 employees, Vienna represents a unique institution in the Illinois system of corrections. The mission of this facility is to provide a minimum-security setting which emphasizes treatment and rehabilitation.

The small size of this institution, combined with focusing of most management decisions at the warden level, has produced unusual staff-training situations. For example, approximately 20% of the employees are currently enrolled in various college-level training programs designed to permit a fuller grasp of the modern correctional movement and its concomitants. Another remarkable program of staff-training involves the voluntary attendance by upwards of 50% of total staff, many families of staff, and others in a once-monthly evening training session with an instructor from nearby Southern Illinois University. The emphasis has been on discussion and trainee envolvement. Acceptance by staff has been very good. Recently, voluntary attendance by inmates in the same training session was permitted.

In summary, staff-training at Vienna has taken on a dimension of appropriate orientation and awareness consistent with minimum-security programming for institutional management and change processes. The active interest of staff at Vienna in receiving such training is obvious, and, management presumably is inclined to go further in this direction.

6. Illinois State Farm (Vandalia). This facility for inmates sentenced to one year or less, has an average of approximately 1,000 inmates, and a staff of about 135 custodial out of a total of 200 personnel. Since this facility provides for short-term institutionalization only (with an average stay in the vicinity of six

months) the prevailing program available until recently has been institutional-labor (basically farming).

Staff-training at Vandalia has not been a priority program in the past. Only minimal orientation training was provided for the newly transferred employee and in-service training for current personnel was at a bare minimum. The present in-service program involves approximately 50% of the custodial personnel group in a weekly meeting (10 weeks) of sixty to ninety minutes. The main purpose of the program is to better acquaint institutional personnel with total operations of the facility services.

In summary, programming for training is at a low level in the Vandalia facility; but, at the same time, there appears to be <u>administrative recognition of various needs in the institution which could be met through training</u>. If appropriate "outside" assistance could be provided this facility in planning and implementing realistic training programs, it is my impression that management would welcome and support this aid.

7. <u>State Reformatory for Women (Dwight)</u>. The women's reformatory has an inmate population of approximately 175 and a total staff of approximately 120. Of the latter, a little over one-half was concerned with primarily custodial duties. The Dwight facility handles both felons and misdemeanants who are at least eighteen years of age. The program at Dwight emphasizes vocational and academic education for inmates, with particular emphasis on industrial sewing training.

Training at Dwight is of three types: (1.) employee workshops, (2.) in-service training for new Correctional Officers, and (3.) training for persons in Guard categories. In each case, the training program was structured and produced locally to meet rather specific institutional needs. Of the three, the major training effort consisted of two ½ day employee workshops for most staff.

Management appears interested in upgrading training activities, but is oriented towards notions of institutional uniqueness. A program which is primarily developed by an outside agency, but with institutional staff assistance, would seem to be useful and acceptable in this setting.

8. Division of Parole Supervision. This unit is staffed by a superintendent, eleven parole supervisors, and fifty-two adult parole agents. Objectives of this unit include the supervision of parolees, assisting them in reintegrating into the community, protection of society, and the prevention of recidivism. A late Departmental publication mentions . . . "authoritative casework procedures . . . used." Approximately 3,000 adult parolees are under supervision, which makes an average caseload of over 57 cases. To a large degree, the parole agents function in a substantially autonomous manner without formal ties to other parts of the correctional process in Illinois.

Training within the Division is the responsibility of a full-time training officer. A training activity involves periodic staff conferences chaired by the trainer and attended by a segment of the parole staff. Frequently, an outside consultant is acquired to assist in the training conferences. In general, this type of training activity emphasizes general correctional information rather than the technicalities of role performance as a parole agent. This Division has a decided advantage in training by having a full-time staff member available for this activity. Considerable progress has been made in providing a foundation for further training programming; however, the value management attaches to training is somewhat less than optimal for program expansion and maximum positive impact.

9. Local Institutions: Some comments are in order concerning current training activities for jail operations. In most counties, except for orientation training which will only incidentally relate to jail operations, staff-training for the various elements involved in jail management is missing. At the same time, our survey questionnaire and follow-up visits

indicated substantial interest in having staff receive training to establish a competency in this area; provided, training content is reasonably related to the sheriff-perceived duties and knowledge which are consistent with the deputy role. Among the city police jails and lockups, it appears that staff-training activity is even more infrequent than is the case in county jails.

Special attention must be given to two very large local-type institutions located in the metropolitan Chicago area--the Chicago House of Correction and the Cook County Jail. Each of these facilities is an independent unit serving the special needs of local governmental bodies. In the past year or two, each has been subjected to public scrutiny by various investigatory bodies (both official and private) and have been criticized for various alleged shortcomings. Among the latter, prominent attention was given to the matter of staff-training--or the absence of such training. It seems to be a fair statement to say that staff-training activity, systematic and based upon institutional needs, was non-existent in either institution. The top administrators at each of these Chicago correctional facilities have spoken of the desirability, if not necessity, for having an adequate staff-training program. Verbal support is given for orientation and in-service training activities; however, until very recently, practical support and implementation was rarely found. Nevertheless, there is currently movement towards programming for such training in the future.

10. Probation: The probation system in Illinois consists of at least 102 separate, virtually autonomous, organizations spread throughout the state. Staffing ranges from one part-time nonpaid volunteer in a southern rural county to more than 30 full-time paid probation officers. Prerequisite qualifications for appointment to this position show wide variation with professional training being rare.

What statistics are available suggest that probation is used rather often in Illinois and that probation officer caseloads are usually high. Recent legislation

has provided some stimulus towards up-grading of Illinois probation staffs by assisting local counties financially. In return, local counties will be required to institute certain personnel practices which will help to provide better trained and professional employees for probation.

Staff-training for Illinois probation is currently at a very low level with, in many cases, no such activity existing. On a statewide level, a state correctional association holds an annual 2½ day meeting which provides 'some' training; however, less than one-half of the more than 102 probation organizations are represented at these meetings. Other training activities involve sporadic individual attendances at conferences and similar settings. In-house training capability within Illinois probation is non-existent. From a number of personal conversations with probation officers from around the state, one fact seems to stand out--a high degree of role defensiveness and superficial rejection of staff-training programming. This attitude is running so strongly in many probation offices that initial implementation of a training program will be very difficult--and especially so if approval by various judiciary involved is not actively given. Nevertheless, the training need is so strong that efforts should be made to supply such training.

B. Some Needs -- Many Recommendations. A lengthy project report deals with this crucial aspect of the report, and is included in the Appendix. At this point, we note a number of the recommendations made as a result of this study.

1. Illinois Department of Public Safety -- General Office: The training needs of this Department are many and varied. While certain needs and recommendations will be specific to the various Departmental facilities, a number are either germane to the entire Department or are in terms appropriate to the general office level at the central headquarters. (Springfield)

a. Perhaps the principle need at state-level, as related to staff-training, is a strongly verbalized and programatically-supported commitment from administration for the idea of training.

b. It is suggested that general-office-level staff review that portion of the Departmental program within their area of responsibility or interest for the purpose of upgrading the priority on resource allocation to training activity. This is true in terms of budgetary resources, staffing resources, training-time resources, and placement in total organizational strategy.

c. It is essential that funding and positions be developed within the Department which are specifically allocated for staff-training and development.

d. It is our recommendation that a full-time management level position be created in the general office (with a title such as Supervisor of Staff Training and Development) and charged with the responsibility and authority, subject to administrative review within the general office, for the following activities: (training)

----assessing organizational needs in terms of personnel abilities, recruitment/retention characteristics, quantitative and qualitative personnel needs for newly-developing programs;

----continuously assess the training needs of each Department facility in the correctional area, for possible training program development;

----assist Departmental facilities in the planning, implementation, and evaluation of training programs;

----develop a series of essential standardized training programs (permitting appropriate local flexibility) for various needs and staff levels, and assisting/stimulating the facilities to utilize these programs within their respective units;

----providing a key resource for administrative information relative to training program costs, instructional or consultant assistance availability, budgeting for training, training equipment, and so on;

----in terms of Departmental budget-making, provide the administration with appropriate cost estimates and similar information, insofar as staff training is concerned--at the Department and facility level;

----serve as a stimulus and facilitator for Departmental administrators and middle-management personnel acceptance of and real support for training;

assist in providing a productive link between the Department and external organizations having resources which could be available for training programs;

e. The fourth recommendation at a general-office-level is offered here on a contingency basis--that is: <u>In the event a Department of Corrections concept is authorized by the legislature, a staff-training program</u> should be written into the program which would provide the following items, at least:

----a general-office-level training division within the Department having separate and auxiliary staff, separate and adequate funding, the responsibility and authority for correctional career development at all staff levels;

----a qualified supervisor at the general office level who is in a position to satisfactorily implement the items in (a.)

----separate physical facility for training all staff-levels

----a system of motivational devices through which training acceptance can be stimulated.

f. A final recommendation at the general-office-level concerns the very nature of staff training. For the greatest effectiveness and economy, by far, staff-training within the Department must be coordinated and integrated into a functional whole focused upon the goals and subgoals of each facility. To better serve staff needs, it is essential that general-office-level administration direct and support be built into each training activity. The Department is too complex and intertwined to realistically permit facility activities dissociation with activities of another facility--including programming for staff-training.

One additional comment is appropriate here. Although the subject of goals and philosophy has been touched on in several places, we feel it absolutely essential to again emphasize the necessity for promulgation of such information to all concerned persons and agencies--both as a general policy and in terms of training program design. The mission of each unit, as well as the Department, must be sufficiently spelled-out so that all staff levels are informed and stimulated towards role performance which is most consistent with policy. We suggest that, in terms of staff training design, it is essential for such goals and philosophies to be made explicit by Departmental administration.

2. The Joliet Penitentiary: The following recommendations are made relative to orientation training:

a. that the purpose of the program be lengthened to a standard four weeks of full-time training and that all new correctional officer employees at Joliet be enrolled in the training;

b. It is recommended that a selected portion of the current institutional staff be specifically trained for roles which will permit and stimulate their involvement in counseling inmates. Upon completion of appropriate training for this function, the staff member would gradually be involved in counseling activities under

expert professional supervision by a member of the Criminologist Division staff; however, in most instances, the staff-member will remain in what is his usual assignment with counseling representing a carefully regulated and apportioned activity. Administrative recognition and legitimization through training for officer's participation in inmate counseling will be a far-reaching step in stimulating change towards realization of a rehabilitation-oriented institution.

c. Bearing in mind the apparend needs of Joliet institutional staff which could be effectively met through training, the evident interest in training by the substantial majority of such personnel, and the feasibility of scheduling such training programs, it is recommended that a systematic and continuous program of in-service training for the correctional officer staff level be implemented at Joliet within the following framework:

----that a Basic In-Service Training Program (BISTP) be established at Joliet for correctional officers, which is designed to provide job-related knowledge and skill-advancement leading to an increased measure of employee performance effectiveness;

----that BISTP be directed within the institution by a full-time program training officer with the requisite skills, with half-time assistance by another staff-member having a correctional officer rating;

----that specific content areas in the BISTP program include, among others:

1. methods of inmate supervision,
2. types of inmates,
3. institutional procedures and divisions
4. the total correctional process,
5. the Illinois system of corrections,
6. legal rights of the institution, employee and inmate,
7. working with inmate groups,

8. security review,
9. role of the correctional officer,
10. racial tensions and the correctional officer,
11. inmate perspectives

d. While a separate and distinct in-service program is being recommended for all correctional line officer staff at Joliet, it is absolutely essential that those same officers receive support and encouragement in the usage of their newly-gained knowledge. Of equal importance is a necessity that supervisory-level line officer staff become increasingly involved in planning and implementation of subordinates activities, as related to training program efforts. It is our view that the supervisory role will become increasingly involved with teaching lower staff levels in an on-the-job format, and in restructuring lower-level staff job activities to reflect the coming emphasis on rehabilitation and treatment within the institution.

<u>It is our recommendation that Supervisors Training Program (STP) be implemented at the Joliet facility within the framework given below</u>:

----that the STP be designed to increase supervisory competence, especially in terms of general supervision activities and that the program be required of all correctional line-officer supervisors.

----that topics included in the STP include the following, among others:

1. the total correctional process,
2. working with groups,
3. principles and techniques for supervision,
4. supervision of inmates
5. communications for institutional effectiveness,
6. social and psychological factors in corrections,
7. and, a full-day field experience.

In summary, we recommend a substantially increased staff-training effort--and especially for the correctional line-officer categories. The programs, as outlined above, will require considerable effort and commitment by the Joliet administration in addition to the direct efforts by trainees in the various programs. The potential benefit of these programs on total institutional operations is so great as to warrant some inconvenience and sacrifice.

3. The Pontiac Penitentiary:

a. It is our recommendation that an orientation training program be developed at Pontiac to provide an intensive instructional period covering approximately the same topics as Joliet's program.

b. We recommend that a selected portion of current Pontiac institutional staff be specially trained for roles which will educationally prepare and stimulate them for their involvement in an inmate counseling program. Upon completion of training, the staff member will gradually be involved in counseling activities under the professional expert supervision of the Criminologist Division staff and consultant; however, in most instances, the participating staff-member will remain in what is his usual primary assignment with counseling representing a carefully regulated and apportioned activity.

c. It is our recommendation that a systematic long-range program of in-service training be provided by administration for all correctional line officers at Pontiac, and that this program be provided through temporary assignment of small officer groups to the Joliet program.

d. We are recommending that two supervisors be assigned to each STP (Supervisors Training Program) at the Joliet facility, thereby facilitating training and substantially reducing training costs.

e. We recommend that Pontiac encourage staff members to participate in individual training programs having special relevance for their job-roles.

4. The Menard Penitentiary

a. It is our recommendation that a standrad two week orientation program be established for correctional line-officer staff transferred to Menard, and that the emphasis in this training be upon (a.) gaining familiarity with the institution: (b.) stimulating acceptance of the philosophy and objectives of Menard; (c.) instructing in the details of job performance in this setting; and (d.) providing an opportunity for job practice under direct supervision by the program trainer.

b. It is our recommendation that a Basic In-Service Training Program (BISTP) be implemented at the Menard facility, and have the express purpose of assisting present correctional line-officer personnel towards a goal of maximum effectiveness in role performance. The recommended program will operate within the following framework:

----that a Basic In-Service Training Program (BISTP) be established at Menard for correctional officers, which is designed to provide job-related knowledge and skill-advancement leading to an increased measure of employee performance effectiveness; and that all correctional officers complete the program.

----that specific content areas in the BISTP program include, among others:

1. methods of inmate supervision,
2. types of inmates,
3. institutional procedures and divisions,
4. the total correctional process,
5. the Illinois system of corrections,
6. legal rights of the institution, employee, and inmate,
7. working with inmate groups,
8. security review,
9. role of the correctional officer,
10. racial tensions and the correctional officer
11. inmate perspectives.

c. It is our recommendation that a Supervisors Training Program (S.T.P.) be implemented at the Menard facility within the framework similar to that described for Joliet I.S.P.

d. We believe that staff-training should increase sharply at Menard -- and especially for the correctional line-officer. Administration supporting the programs described here will undoubtedly find itself in a sometimes difficult position with that staff element who will resist any change; nevertheless, it is our feeling that institutional administration in this setting is in favor of training programs which will be of benefit, and will do its utmost to provide adequate support for training.

5. The Vandalia State Farm:

a. It is our recommendation that Vandalia administration strengthen its present "orientation program" for new correctional line officer staff by the following means:

----provision of a formal detailed operating plan for use in planning and evaluating each new employee;

----assignment of one experienced staff-member the responsibility for orientation programming of new employees;

----development of means which will emphasize the special characteristics of Vandalia;

----provision of a rulebook for the new employees.

The availability of assistance from other institutions having a similar program (Menard, for example) should be explored and utilized, if appropriate.

b. It is our recommendation that correctional line-officer staff at Vandalia be assigned in small groups to the continuous Basic In-Service Training Program (BISTP) at Menard Penitentiary.

c. Particularly at Vandalia, we believe that a training program for correctional line officers is essential - especially in view of the absence of significant middle-management numbers. It is our recommendation that supervising correctional officers at Vandalia be assigned to the Supervisors Training Program (STP) at Menard.

d. It is our recommendation that Vandalia staff should be encouraged by administration to participate in individual training opportunities, as they arise.

6. The Vienna State Penitentiary:

a. Due to previous in-service training activities at Vienna, correctional line-officer staff appears to have made substantial progress in role-performance increased effectiveness. We feel that the most recent program series was quite effective in obtaining its limited goals and that, with some modifications, this type of program be continued now as a special Basic In-Service Training Program.

b. It is our recommendation that correctional line-officer supervisors from the Vienna facility be assigned to the Supervisor's Training Program (STP) at Menard, in groups of two each.

c. It is our recommendation that Vienna staff-members be encouraged by administration to participate in individual training opportunities, as available and appropriate.

7. Dwight Reformatory for Women: We have one recommendation regarding staff-training at Dwight:

a. that the program be made more intensive initially with more opportunity for supervised learning experiences;

b. It is our recommendation that Dwight administration assign groups of two supervisor corrections officers each to the Supervisors Training Program at the Joliet Penitentiary.

c. As appropriate, we recommend that Dwight staff be encouraged to avail themselves of individual training opportunities.

8. Division of Adult Parole Supervision: It is our recommendation that a concerted effort be made by Division administration to provide, in addition to monthly in-service training conferences, two refresher workshops annually--one downstate and one in Chicago.

9. Probation: We recommend that a specific and highly focused training program be designed for probation workers in Illinois. The program will have the following objectives:

----to provide an impetus towards general operational standards for probation in Illinois;

----to sensitize probation staff in the nuances and intricacies of counseling clients;

----to assist in the delineation and re-definition of probation staff roles, especially in terms of change processes leading to ideal types;

----to provide a start in establishing a core curriculum of subjects and content appropriate for probation of operations.

10. Local Institutions:

a. It is our recommendation that provision be made to train sheriff's deputies and municipality police assigned principal duties in local institutions towards a goal of properly balancing the law enforcement and correctional aspects of their roles.

b. It is also our recommendation that, upon operationalization of BISTP and STP in state-level facilities, ways and means be explored to provide for limited participation by staffs of locally-administered institutions.

11. The Illinois Youth Commission:

a. It is recommended that the Illinois Youth Commission establish the position -- Coordinator of Staff Training and Program Development.

b. It is recommended that each division and large unit of the Illinois Youth Commission have an individual whose major responsibility is staff training and program development.

c. It is recommended that serious consideration be given to the establishment of a Training Center for all staff levels adjacent to or part of (but semi-independent of) a current facility, to provide orientation, continuation, and special training.

d. It is recommended that, in the light of a severe shortage of qualified counseling professionals, consideration be given to redefining the non-professional's role to include a counseling function; and, to be most effective, appropriate training be provided to learn and support this new role.

e. It is recommended that the Illinois Youth Commission go beyond its own staff, wherever appropriate, to obtain necessary consultant and/or instructional staff for staff training programming.

f. It is recommended that the Illinois Youth Commission encourage students interested in juvenile corrections as a professional career through a carefully planned program of stipends and work expenses.

g. It is recommended that strong consideration be given to the development, distribution, and implementation of an agency policy and operating manual.

h. It is recommended that the Illinois Youth Commission consider an increased program of staff training for all staff levels.

i. It is recommended that the Administrative Services Division engage in a series of activities, coordinated with the efforts of the Coordinator, designed to aid in operationalizing and supporting an agency-wide staff training program.

j. It is recommended that, as program change or demonstration programs are developed, the needs and advantages of appropriate staff training be built-in to the planning and implementation phases.

k. It is recommended that, in conjunction with the agency public relations staff, an intensive and well-grounded internal information program be promulgated among agency personnel.

l. It is recommended that special attention be given in all phases of staff training to the continued integration of agency division functions as they bear on the continuum of youth involvement with the agency.

m. We urge each correctional administrator and manager in Illinois to critically view the operation he controls and to seek opportunities for utilization of new or reinforced knowledge presented in staff-training programs. As public servants, we believe that this group -- as well as university-based correctional expertise -- must lead the way towards an improved correctional movement in Illinois. It is our firm conviction that the programs and suggestions presented in this report will assist Illinois corrections moving this direction.

C. The Continuation Grant Proposal: The continuation grant proposal presents a series of focused training programs for correctional staff-segments having intensive contact with the client; thereby, enhancing opportunities for maximum staff participation in the correctional rehabilitation process.

The primary goals during the coming twelve months are four-fold:

1. to provide a tangible and continuing impetus for correctional staff-training programming in Illinois;

2. to provide a series of training activities for Illinois corrections;

3. to assist in the development of additional programs of training and staff development, and the implementation of others;

4. to provide consultation, assistance, and evaluation towards achievement of in-house training capability (and interest) by the various agencies serving correctional clients.

In addition to the considerable amount of grant-time concerned with development and implementation consultation during this second grant year, a number of specific training programs or activities will be scheduled, including the following:

1. Basic In-Service Training Program for Correctional Line-Officers (BISTP);

2. Supervisor's Training Program for Line-Officers (STP);

3. Correctional Administrators Workshop Series;

4. Correctional Staff-Trainers Workshop Series;

5. Community Correctional Worker Training Program Series

6. Newsletter for Correctional Staff-Trainers;

7. Jail Correctional Worker Training Program.

Through programs and services, the continuation-grant year will stimulate a significant advance in correctional staff competency for full participation in security, treatment and rehabilitation programs. At the same time, an adequate foundation will be provided for line-officer involvement in advanced training leading toward active, positive participation as a change-agent in corrections.

Staff-training in Illinois corrections occupies a low-priority status in programming for total operations. Most correctional staff, once past some brief form of orientation training, receive minimal amounts of in-service training during their employment. Even in those agencies providing such training, emphasis is placed upon situation

needs (security for the correctional officer and reports/ caseload manipulation for the community-based correctional worker) with little time or inclination for content such as correctional roles, treatment, philosophies, ways and means, communications, leadership, supervision, and management. As a result, the correctional role often fails to fulfill its broad potential as a change-agent.

Organization for corrections in Illinois presents a complex model of autonomous and partially-autonomous facilities providing a variety of client services. There is no single source of administration direction or integration of such services. The result, as might be expected, is a series of discontinuities in programming for correctional facility organization and operation. This is especially noticeable in terms of staff-training.

Although staff-training is currently a minor activity in Illinois corrections, study supported by an O.L.E.A. grant during the past six months indicates a significantly high degree of interest by staff in the furtherance of their job skills through appropriate in-service training programming. In general, correctional administrators also verbalize support for an augmented

staff-training program and, most importantly, have indicated their readiness to release staff-time for this purpose. The time seems opportune for development and implementation of a much-expanded staff-training effort in Illinois corrections. Initially, we believe that an outside agency can do most to solidify and build upon agency interest in training; however, it is essential that the training role become an integral part of agency operations with emphasis on "in-house" training capability.

While Illinois corrections would most likely benefit from a number of approaches which might be taken, it is our judgment that the courses proposed below will be the most effective and economical in introducing a broadly based staff-training program.

1. It is apparent that increased contact between staff and correctional client provides an interface which, properly structured, is conducive of an environment setting appropriate for rehabilitation. Structuring, as used here, refers to the staff ability for positive relationships with the inmate or his community counterpart. To secure this ability and to program it in a systematic manner having greatest impact towards correctional

rehabilitation, Illinois corrections staff must be trained in subjects beyond those involved directly with security. While recognizing the importance of security, we believe that correctional staff-roles can and must have many faces, including those which are directly concerned with the correctional rehabilitation process. A foundation of content knowledge and techniques appropriate to assisting the correctional client (rather than complete concern with security operations) is essential to reach this goal.

2. Various training organizations are in a position to assist Illinois correctional agencies in their staff-training activities; however, for the greatest effectiveness and economy, training must finally be in the hands of correctional staff. Through this grant, we can provide a stimulus for and a major assistance to Illinois corrections by planning, developing, demonstrating, and evaluating individual or total-agency training activities; but, eventually, the agency must accept this need as its own responsibility. Programs in this proposal are designed to encourage in-house capability for correctional staff training.

3. <u>A third goal is the initiation of a dialogue between the various elements of Illinois corrections</u>, towards an elimination of the discontinuities in the correctional process. Staff-training appears to be an appropriate arena for this type of dialogue.

Main focus of this proposal is upon providing correctional line-officer staff with appropriate staff-training programs. Secondarily, we will provide a series of training workshops for community correctional personnel. To do these effectively, however, we feel it is essential that other significant segments of correctional staff be involved in training--both in support of the basic training programs and for furtherance of their own job skills. To this end, correctional administrators, line-officer supervisors, and staff-trainers will each be involved in specific instruction programs.

Training methods used in the various programs suggested here will reflect correctional staff-training experiences at our Center during the past few years. In general, emphasis will be placed upon instructional models utilizing participant involvement and interaction

to the greatest appropriate degree. Included are the following instructional methods:

1. modified T-Group
2. videotape
3. audio-visual methods
4. discussion
5. lectures
6. buzz sessions
7. conferences
8. problem-solving
9. telephone conference calls

We believe it essential to provide a systematic means of evaluating each training program. Our purpose will be to continually re-define methods and content as accumulation of training experiences necessitate--and, not for traditional academic research. The specific evaluation measures for each program are integrated into the individual program outlines.

Our purpose in involvement is the preparation of a design appropriate for continuation of training after termination of federal funding. Specifically, our contacts with the various correctional agencies--and particularly the Illinois Department of Public Safety--strongly suggest the continuation of similar and advanced staff-training programming in future years. In this sense, federal funding is truly "seed-money".

IV.

Looking to the Future

Even as the past is reviewed it is essential that we look to the future in Illinois corrections. Planning, to be most effective and economical, cannot proceed on a helter-skelter or sporadic basis. Rather, planning is but a segment of the highly integrated programming function in an agency. The development and organization for planning is crucial to the implementation and evaluation of overall program design. It is useful, therefore, to briefly comment upon several significant aspects of the planning function as it is related to Illinois correctional staff-training.

A. The OLEA Continuation-Grant Proposal. Continuation-grant activity is specifically designed to stimulate Illinois correctional organizations towards a genuine acceptance of the needs and methods for staff-training. It is based upon the evaluation of present attitudes and future trends in Illinois corrections.

In terms of strategy, the programs to be presented through continuation-grant funding are specifically formulated to embrace a philosophy of training continuity;

both, at the internal level and in terms of structuring for a continuing growth of such training activity. Our intention has been to avoid structuring of training in terms of a "one-shot" opportunity. Careful consideration was given to planning the individual subprograms in such a way as will permit and encourage continued training activity after termination of federal funding support.

A primary consideration in program planning has been to stimulate "in-house" training capability among the Illinois correctional organizations. An accumulation of training experiences in many settings strongly suggest the desirability of this approach; thus, grant training activities are planned to assist the institutional trainer (for example) who is part of the permanent agency personnel towards a professionalization and expansion of his training role. This is accomplished through direct training workshops to give institutional trainers content input; through supportive training activities, as with a grant-sponsored and staffed workshop for correctional administrators; and, through providing a multi-facet resource for the local trainer.

In the view just described, therefore, an OLEA continuation-grant will serve as a catalyst, facilitator, and stimulus for the production and retention of agency training programs. It is our feeling that, not only is this course appropriate in terms of overall OLEA agency objectives, it is the only effective way to proceed at this point in Illinois corrections.

B. Legislative Budgeting for Training. Regrettable and surprising as it may seem, until very recently Illinois correctional agencies had little or no funds reserved (either internally or by the legislature) for staff-training programming. Training, such as it was, necessarily was financed from other funds and/or activities. While such arrangements may serve for a time, it is not a desirable or particularly effective subterfuge.

Accordingly, with the information developed during OLEA grant # 197 study, we came to be in a position suggesting change in the method of funding training. With cooperation of the Illinois Department of Public Safety, a training budget was developed for the Department on a facility-by-facility basis. The individual

budget recommendations have been forwarded to each facility administrator for review and approval. Eventually, it is anticipated that the budget requests will be presented to the state legislature for appropriation.

Through this "added-on" project activity, a substantial and concrete step has been taken to insure continuation of correctional staff-training programming after termination of federal funds availability. It is an essential step if we are to develop and sustain training programs at a sufficient level to produce constructive impact.

In another vein, we are now developing plans requesting that the Governor's Committee on Criminal Justice reserve a portion of its 1968-69 LEAA planning funds for further planning activities in terms of correctional staff-training. Our hope is to stimulate a systematic and integrated approach to staff-training which will include all Illinois correctional units.

C. Utilization of New Knowledge. An immense amount of knowledge is constantly being produced in the behavioral sciences. Indeed, highly sophisticated

computers are now being employed to sort-out topically a maze of publications, with the hope that some order can eventually be brought from current literary chaos. There is no doubt but that these comments are just as equally true for the field of corrections.

Yet, we have serious reservations about the degree to which this new knowledge can be brought to bear upon Illinois corrections -- and for several important reasons. A first serious difficulty, applicable to the entire field of behavioral sciences, is concerned with the problem of translating theory and theoretical research into needs and operations of the applied setting. Two foci of this difficulty are apparent:

1. for the correctional practitioners there is a substantial degree of defensiveness as he views his theory and academic oriented correctional peers;

2. for the correctional theoretician (using this term in a rather broad sense), there is often an attitude of disdain, misplaced criticism, and impatience directed towards correctional practitioners

The resulting and inherent philosophical and inherent differences between these two groups has led to a serious communications gap with persistently lessened

opportunities for seeking reapprochment. Both "sides" are suspicious of the other and continue to jealously guard their own piece of expertise. Fortunately, there has recently been some movement away from this narrow parochialism as individual efforts are exerted towards some meaningful kind of accommodation.

A second difficulty is concerned with the very organization of Illinois corrections; that is, the multiplicity of autonomous and semi-autonomous agencies having corrections responsibilities staggers the imagination. And, even within some of these agencies, a number of semi-independent facilities now exist. The complexity of organization suggests two problems which must be recognized and surmounted -- if the "new knowledge" is to significantly benefit Illinois Corrections:

1. in terms of administration, we resort to the epithet----"too many cooks spoil the soup."---- and, regrettably, make it exceedingly difficult to introduce needed change;

2. in terms of a philosophical basis, the present situation effectively prevents a system-wide approach to correctional planning and implementation.

Since there is a growing concern in Illinois for establishment of some form of new structure for corrections, we might note here that some unification of the correctional

responsibility would appear to be desirable. (To forestall any suggestion to the contrary, the project director is not suggesting preference for any one particular proposal other than one which would include responsible agency and facility consolidation--administratively and functionally.)

The third difficulty to be encountered must be concerned with tradition. Certainly, Illinois corrections is steeped in the mold of a strong emphasis on custody and security. Indeed, it is not far-fetched to suggest that Illinois has developed over the years into <u>one of the nations foremost penal systems in terms of security</u>. Which, is fine. But in terms of having a tradition of flexibility for confronting the demands of change and programming movement, the security orientation has provided but a small platform. Until very recently, there was a general belief held by administrators and educators that corrections staff, per se, would not permit much movement away from present overwhelming security concerns; would not permit programming or staff-training in line with a modern correctional philosophy emphasizing security <u>and</u> rehabilitation; would not be

willing to have the the non-corrections "outsider" participate fully in program planning or staff-training.

To a large extent, these beliefs have not been borne out in recent questionnaire surveys. For example, the Louis Harris Associates survey organization has discovered that corrections staff are highly concerned with their programs, need and opportunities for staff-training, and the impace on inmates. The survey strongly suggested a high degree of correctional-staff acceptance for movement towards programming going beyond mere custody. The need and acceptance for staff-training was also evident from this survey report. (In a parallel study of institutional staff in the Illinois Department of Public Safety, similar findings were obtained--see separate report in volume II of this Final Report.) It is our belief that personnel will be accepting of appropriately focused and structured staff-training.

On the positive side, the infusion of "new blood" via employment of additional professionals is encouraging for utilization of new knowledge. In addition, professionals currently engaged in Illinois corrections will be

increasingly in a position to use their full range of expertise as their numerical weight has greater impact.

A second positive feature is the ever so gradual breaking down of barriers restricting the "outsider" from becoming involved in correctional programming. This project is an example of how agencies and individuals not having correctional client responsibilities, per se, are becoming increasingly involved. In a very real sense, this type of role can serve a facilitating and stimulating function for an otherwise essentially closed system. Presently, it appears that such activities will necessarily be funded through federal programs; but, for maximum impact, it is desirable that state appropriations gradually assume the costs for demonstrably useful activities.

V

A Final Thought

We have only begun . . . . .

ERIC Clearinghouse
APR 6 1970
on Adult Education